

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

The specification has been amended by capitalizing trademarked products. In addition, the disclosure at page 46, line 24 through page 47, line 14, has been deleted.

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the subject matter of Claim 2 therein; Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 has been amended by replacing the term "latent image bearer" with --photoreceptor-- and by restricting the developer to the one according to Claim 15.

New Claims 19 and 20 have been added, analogous to Claims 17 and 18, respectively, but limiting the developer to the one-component developer of Claim 16.

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 1 and 3-20 are now pending in the application. Of these claims, Claim 10 stands withdrawn from consideration.

REMARKS

The rejections of various claims over U.S. 2004/0115550 (Sugiura et al) and over U.S. 2003/0180644 (Nanya et al), are respectfully traversed. The earliest prior art date for Sugiura et al is its U.S. filing date of August 21, 2003. The earliest prior art date of Nanya et al is its U.S. filing date of March 24, 2003. **Submitted herewith** is a certified English translation of the priority application herein, i.e., Japan 2003/010902, filed January 20, 2003. The Examiner is respectfully requested to find that Applicants are entitled to their priority date under 35 U.S.C. § 119. Accordingly, neither Sugiura et al nor Nanya et al is prior art herein. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections over Sugiura et al and over Nanya et al be withdrawn.

The rejections of various claims over U.S. 2003/0152859 (Emoto et al), are respectfully traversed. All of the presently-pending claims now contain the limitations of Claim 2, not subject to these rejections. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that they be withdrawn.

The rejection of various claims over JP 09/197716 (JP '716) alone, and combined with other prior art, are respectfully traversed. All of the presently-pending claims now contain the limitations of Claim 2, not subject to these rejections. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that they be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. Indeed, the rejection would now appear to be moot in view of the above-discussed amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

The objection to the specification at paragraph 5 of the Office Action is respectfully traversed. Regarding the finding by the Examiner that Claim 14 lacks antecedent basis in the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure at page 37, lines 17-19

provides antecedent basis. With regard to Claim 17, the term "latent image bearer" has been replaced with --photoreceptor--. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The objection to the disclosure at paragraph 4 of the Office Action is respectfully traversed. Trademarks have been capitalized by the above-discussed amendment. In addition, the so-called second process steps of Example 1 have been deleted. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

All of the presently pending and active claims in this application are now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor, Ph.D.
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Harris A. Pitlick
Registration No. 38,779

RLT:HAP\la